



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,128	12/14/2001	Jeanette McCarthy	MMI-001	9066
959	7590	05/06/2005	EXAMINER	
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP. 28 STATE STREET BOSTON, MA 02109			SITTON, JEHANNE SOUAYA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1634	

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/017,128

**Applicant(s)**

MCCARTHY, JEANETTE

**Examiner**

Jehanne S. Sitton

**Art Unit**

1634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-117 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-117 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I: Claims 1-34 and 51-61, drawn to a method for diagnosing or aiding in the diagnosis of a vascular disease by detecting a polymorphism in the PLCG1 gene and the PAI-2 gene, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
  - II: Claims 35-36, drawn to a computer readable medium, classified in class 365, subclass 94.
  - III: Claims 37-43, drawn to an electronic system, classified in class 711, subclass 101.
  - IV: Claims 44-50, drawn to compositions comprising nucleic acids, classified in class 536, subclass 23.
  - V: Claims 62-69, drawn to an internet based method for assessing risk, classified in class 705, subclass 2.
  - VI: Claims 70-71, drawn to a medical information system, classified in class 700, subclass 90.
  - VII: Claims 72-76, drawn to a computerized method for providing medical advice, classified in class 128, subclass 92.
  - VIII: Claims 77-87, drawn to a method of self assessing risk using an electronic device, classified in class 714, subclass 1.

Art Unit: 1634

IX: Claims 88-117, drawn to a method of generating health assessment using information and business based systems and methods, classified in class 705, subclass 3.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The inventions of group I and the inventions of groups II-III and VI are unrelated.

Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different modes of operation, different functions and different effects. Additionally, the computer readable medium of group II, the electronic system of group III, and the medical system of group VI are not used in the method of diagnosis of group I.

The inventions of groups I and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the products can be used to determine gene expression, which is not required to practice the method of Group IV. The search for each group presents a serious search burden as the searches for each are not coextensive in scope. Art relating to methods of detecting polynucleotides would not necessarily provide descriptive sequence information on the polynucleotide itself, and vice versa.

The inventions of group I and the inventions of groups V and VII-IX are unrelated.

Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together

Art Unit: 1634

and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different modes of operation, different functions and different effects. The method of group I does not require any of the method steps of groups V or VII-IX.

The inventions of groups II-IV and VI are patentably distinct because they are structurally and functionally distinct products or systems. The computer readable medium is a device used to store information. The electronic system of group III is used to process data and is structurally distinct from the computer readable medium of group II and the medical system of group VI. The nucleic acid of group IV is a biological molecule composed of deoxyribonucleotides linked by phosphodiester bonds and assumes the form of a double helix. It can be used in hybridization or to express proteins and is structurally distinct from the inventions of groups II, III, and VI. The medical information system of group VI is composed of a system of means for assessing risk comprising, for example, a means for obtaining information, means for representing information, means for processing a digital genetic profile, and means for displaying a report. This system is structurally and functionally distinct from the devices of groups II and III and the biological molecule of group IV. The search for each of group II, III, IV, and VI are not coextensive with each other and therefore presents a serious search burden for the office.

The inventions of groups II, III, and VI and the methods of groups V, and VI-IX are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a

Art Unit: 1634

materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the devices can be used to process, store, and analyze any information, and are not limited to use in the methods of group V and VI-IX. The search for the devices of groups II, III, and VI is not coextensive with the search for the methods of groups V and VI-IX, and therefore presents a serious search burden for the office.

The inventions of group IV and the inventions of groups V and VII-IX are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different modes of operation, different functions and different effects. The methods of groups V and VII-IX do not require the product of group IV.

The methods of groups V and VI-IX are patentably distinct. They have different purposes and effects and require different method steps. The search for each group presents a serious burden on the office because the search for each method is not coextensive with the search for any other method.

3. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to

Art Unit: 1634

final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Art Unit: 1634

5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for one group is not required for any other group, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

7. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Jehanne Sitton whose telephone number is (571) 272-0752. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM and on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Jones, can be reached on (571) 272-0745. The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants



Application/Control Number: 10/017,128

Page 8

Art Unit: 1634

can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.



Jehanne Sitton

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1634

5/5/05